

### Remarks

Claims 1-21 are currently pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 5, 9, and 17 have been amended while claims 13 and 19 have been cancelled. Applicants assert that the claims are now in condition for allowance as set forth more fully below.

### Interview Summary

The undersigned participated in a telephone interview with the Examiner on April 5, 2005. During the interview, subject matter of the present application was discussed in relation to the current rejections based on the Dasgupta reference. In particular, it was discussed that the present application provides for a system independent tool for modifying the application in real time, such as by use of JAVA RMI and JAVA Virtual Machine. It was further discussed that the Dasgupta reference uses a probe debugging tool which by its very nature as being a debugging tool is system dependent.

### 102 Rejections

Claims 1-4, 9-12, and 17 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Disgupta. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The claims now include recitations to the tool being system independent. As a representative example, claim 1 recites using a system independent interface to connect to an application executing on system independent platform on an application server, the application server having a computer memory, through the system independent interface, acquiring program data that defines the underlying program structure including one or more object language components of the application, displaying the program data including the one or more object language components to a maintenance person, accepting a command from the maintenance person, and through the system independent interface, executing the command to cause the program data of the executing application to be modified without suspending or terminating the executing application. Thus, the claims are not directed to system dependent interfaces and platforms upon which the application executes, but are instead directed to system independent ones.

Disgupta discloses a probe debugging tool. Such debugging tools are by their very nature system dependent because they operate at the machine code level to analyze each instruction that is executed. Accordingly, Disgupta fails to disclose all of the elements of the claims because Disgupta fails to disclose that the tool is system independent. Furthermore, with respect to claims 9 and 17, Disgupta fails to disclose that the system independence is achieved by utilizing JAVA RMI as the interface while executing the application on a JAVA virtual machine. Accordingly, claims 9 and 17 are allowable for this additional reason.

Because the disclosure of Disgupta is directed exclusively to a system dependent probe debugging tool, there is no motivation to modify Disgupta to utilize system independent interfaces and platforms. Therefore, it is asserted that these claims are not rendered obvious by any combination of references based on Disgupta.

### 103 Rejections

Claims 5, 13, and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Disgupta in view of Matthews. Claims 6, 14, and 18 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Disgupta in view of Flanagan. Claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 20, and 21 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Disgupta in view of Rag and further in view of Engel (US Pat 6,681,389). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Each of these claims depends from an allowable base claim and is also allowable for at least the same reasons. Notably, because the rejection of each of these claims is based on Disgupta, the rejection fails because Disgupta is limited to system dependent probe debugging tools.


### Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1-21 is now in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due beyond the fee for continued examination. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 5, 2005

  
Jeramie J. Keys  
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC  
P.O. Box 71355  
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355  
(404) 849.2093